

Applicant: Tapani Honkanen et al.
Application No.: 10/596,481
Response to Office action dated Sep. 15, 2008
Response filed Dec. 15, 2008

Remarks

Claims 17–32, 34, and 36 remain pending in the application. In the Office action dated Sep. 15, 2008, claims 17–21, 28, 29, 33, and 35 were rejected as obvious over Banning (WO 98/35094) in view of Austin (US 3,208,292). Claims 22–27, 30–32, 34, and 36 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 22, 30, 34 and 36 have been rewritten in independent form.

Claim 17 has been amended to require that the second gear be *mounted about the second shaft and directly intermeshed with the first gear*, and thus the adjustment element (which adjusts the phase relationship between shafts) is arranged between the second gear and the second drive shaft. Austin employs one motor that drives both shafts through a gear arrangement, and has an actuator 108 which allows the phase angle between the first and second shaft to be changed. However the actuator 108 of Austin is not located between the second shaft and a *second gear mounted about the second shaft and directly intermeshed with the first gear* which drives the first shaft.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance.
Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J.G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934
Attorney for Applicant
Stiennon & Stiennon
P.O. Box 1667
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667
(608) 250-4870
Amdt2.res

December 15, 2008 (1:45pm)